

<b>ACTIONS</b>	
<b>Joint Meeting of the Four Boards, March 3, 2009</b>	
March 5, 2009	
<b><u>AGENDA ITEM/ACTION</u></b>	<b><u>ASSIGNMENT</u></b>
1. Call to Order. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by the Chairman, Mr. Slutzky. All BOS members were present except Mr. Slutzky. Also present were Bob Tucker, and Larry Davis.</li> </ul>	
2. Presentation of South Fork Rivanna Reservoir Stewardship Task Force final report – Ms. Sally Thomas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>RECEIVED.</b></li> </ul>	
4. Action by vote of each Board on Task Force Recommendations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>MOVED</b>, by a vote of 6:0, that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors approve the first five recommendations on the “Bullet Summary of Task Force Recommendations” with the first bullet item being amended to add that the Rivanna Water &amp; Sewer Authority will seek additional legal advice with respect to the potential legal implications of modifications to the existing permitted water supply plan.</li> </ul>	(Attachment 1)
7. Adjourn to March 4, 2009, 9:00 p.m. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m.</li> </ul>	

/mrh

Attachment 1 – Bullet Summary of Task Force Recommendations

## ATTACHMENT 1

### BULLET SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Qualification of Task Force Recommendations: “. . .consistent with the Task Force mandate which places the fundamentals of the Water Supply Plan beyond the Task Force purview. .”

Task Force Recommendations:

- Investigate if inflowing sediment will likely create new wetlands and if so, seek legal counsel and engineering advice toward understanding if these wetlands can be removed by permit under federal and state law at some future date when water storage beyond the storage currently permitted at Ragged Mountain is needed.
- Investigate technical feasibility (including effectiveness and probable cost) through a consultant, and the permitability through discussions with federal and state agencies, of constructing a sediment forebay for the reservoir.
- Maintain a dialogue with the University of Virginia and “recreational users” of the South Fork Reservoir on conditions that inhibit future rowing and “recreational pursuits”, and discuss maintenance programs that may correct such conditions to the extent the financial investment required for maintenance is considered “important”.
- Continue “Community” efforts to reduce sediment and pollutants entering the Reservoir, to include “strengthening and enforcing” water protection ordinances and programs “such as those of the Thomas Jefferson Soil & Water Conservation District.”
- Continue to monitor growth of hydrilla and study effective management options.
- Investigate “selective dredging” when “decision makers” conclude that benefits may be “worth the cost” by:
  - Developing a map identifying priority areas and cleared depths for recreational uses;
  - Identify areas for selective dredging to prevent wetland creation from sedimentation;
  - Identify physical obstacles (e.g., tree stumps) to selective dredging of reservoir;
  - Undertake bathymetric surveys “in the critical areas for [selective] dredging”;
  - Take and analyze sediment core samples “in the critical areas for [selective] dredging”;
  - Identify access, staging, and dewatering areas for selective dredging;
  - Explore “opportunistic dredging” based on attractiveness of “market conditions”;
  - Estimate impact and duration of selective dredging on residents and aquatic habitat, and assess prevention, preparedness and response measures for water quality and treatment impacts.
- Determine in relation to other infrastructure financial priorities if the public interest is served by issuing a Request for Proposals for “removal of sediment”.